arXiv:1703.07307v2 [cs.SY] 22 Mar 2017

ON RECURSIVE COMPUTATION OF COPRIME FACTORIZATIONS OF RATIONAL MATRICES

ANDREAS VARGA*

Abstract. We propose general computational procedures based on descriptor state-space realizations to compute coprime factorizations of rational matrices with minimum degree denominators. Enhanced recursive pole dislocation techniques are developed, which allow to successively place all poles of the factors into a given "good" domain of the complex plane. The resulting McMillan degree of the denominator factor is equal to the number of poles lying in the complementary "bad" region and therefore is minimal. The new pole dislocation techniques are employed to compute coprime factorizations with proper and stable factors of arbitrary improper rational matrices and coprime factorizations with inner denominators. The proposed algorithms work for arbitrary descriptor representations, regardless they are stabilizable or detectable.

Key words. rational matrices, coprime factorizations, computational methods, descriptor systems

AMS subject classifications. 26C15, 93B40, 93C05, 93B55, 93D15

1. Introduction.

Consider a disjunct partition of the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ as

$$\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}_g \cup \mathbb{C}_b, \quad \mathbb{C}_g \cap \mathbb{C}_b = \emptyset\,, \tag{1}$$

where $\infty \notin \mathbb{C}_g$. Any rational matrix $G(\lambda)$ can be expressed in a left fractional form

$$G(\lambda) = M^{-1}(\lambda)N(\lambda)\,, \tag{2}$$

or in a right fractional form

$$G(\lambda) = N(\lambda)M^{-1}(\lambda)\,, \tag{3}$$

where both the denominator factor $M(\lambda)$ and the numerator factor $N(\lambda)$ have only poles in $\mathbb{C}_g$. Any method to compute a right factorization can be used to compute a left factorization by simply applying it to the transposed matrix $G(\lambda)$. Therefore, in this paper we only focuss on right factorizations of the form (3).

Of special interest are the so-called coprime factorizations, where the factors satisfy additional conditions. A fractional representation of $G(\lambda)$ of the form (3), with $N(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda)$ having only poles in $\mathbb{C}_g$, is a *right coprime factorization* (RCF) over $\mathbb{C}_g$, if there exist $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ with poles only in $\mathbb{C}_g$ which satisfy $U(\lambda)M(\lambda) + V(\lambda)N(\lambda) = I$. Coprime factorizations with minimum-degree denominators satisfy additionally the condition that the number of poles of the resulting $M(\lambda)$ is equal to the number of poles of $G(\lambda)$ in $\mathbb{C}_b$. When counting poles, both finite and infinite poles are counted with their multiplicities. When determining minimum-degree coprime factorizations, all poles of $M(\lambda)$ can be arbitrarily chosen from $\mathbb{C}_g$. The coprime factorizations over a "good" domain of poles $\mathbb{C}_g$, also including factorizations with special properties of the denominator factor (e.g., stability, innerness), are important in extending various controller synthesis methods [22] to more general systems or in solving synthesis problems of fault detection filters [18] in the most general setting.

If $G(\lambda)$ represents the *transfer-function matrix* (TFM) of a (generalized) linear time-invariant system, then the variable λ stays either for the complex variable s in the Laplace transform, in the case of a continuous-time system, or for the complex variable z in the Z-transform, in the case of a discrete-time system. In this case, $G(\lambda)$ has real coefficients (i.e., all entries are ratios of polynomials with real coefficients) and $\mathbb{C}_g$ and $\mathbb{C}_b$ are chosen symmetrically located with respect to the real axis, with $\mathbb{C}_g$ having at least one point on the real axis. This guarantees the existence of real factorizations, where both factors $N(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda)$ have real coefficients. Typical choices for $\mathbb{C}_g$ are the open left half-plane of $\mathbb{C}$ for a continuous-time system, or the open unit disc centered in the origin for a discrete-time system. In these cases, the corresponding factorizations are called proper and stable RCFs. An important class of such

*Gilching, Germany (varga.andreas@gmail.com).

factorizations is the class of stable and proper RCF with inner denominators, where $M(\lambda)$ is additionally an inner TFM satisfying the all-pass property $M^{\sim}(\lambda)M(\lambda) = I$. Recall that, the conjugate TFM $M^{\sim}(\lambda)$ is defined in a continuous-time setting as $M^{\sim}(s) = M^T(-s)$, while in a discrete-time setting $M^{\sim}(z) = M^T(1/z)$. A TFM $M(\lambda)$ which satisfies only $M^{\sim}(\lambda)M(\lambda) = I$ is called all-pass. Therefore, an inner TFM is a stable all-pass TFM.

For the computation of right coprime factorizations with minimum-degree denominators a recursive pole-dislocation-based approach can be employed. Inspired by the ideas of Belevitch [2], such a method has been developed in [13] and later refined in [12]. The basic approach can be simply described as an n_b-step procedure, where n_b is the number of poles of $G(\lambda)$ in $\mathbb{C}_b$. To compute the RCF of $G(\lambda)$, it is possible to find a sequence of n_b nonsingular rational matrices $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n_b$, each of McMillan degree 1, with one (arbitrary) pole in $\mathbb{C}_g$ and one (fixed) zero in $\mathbb{C}_b$, such that the sequences $N_i(\lambda) := N_{i-1}(\lambda)\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ and $M_i(\lambda) := M_{i-1}(\lambda)\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n_b$, initialized with $N_0(\lambda) = G(\lambda)$ and $M_0(\lambda) = I$, generate the factors $N(\lambda) := N_{n_b}(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda) := M_{n_b}(\lambda)$ of the RCF (3). The zero of $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ is chosen to cancel with a pole of $N_{i-1}(\lambda)$ lying in $\mathbb{C}_b$, such that after n_b steps, all poles of $G(\lambda)$ are cancelled and dislocated to values in $\mathbb{C}_g$. This approach can be also employed when additionally imposing that all elementary factors $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ are inner. In the case of complex poles, the above technique leads, in general, to complex factorizations. Therefore, to obtain real factorizations, for each complex conjugate pair of poles a second-degree real factor can be used to cancel simultaneously both poles. Second-degree factors may also be necessary when dislocating a pair of real poles into a pair of complex conjugate poles. General formulas for constructing first- and second-degree factors are given in [13]. In the case of an improper $G(\lambda)$, similar first-degree formulas can be devised for cancelling a single infinite pole.

In this paper, we describe general descriptor state-space realization based versions of the above recursive approach, which eliminate the delicate computations involving manipulation of rational matrices. The recursive pole dislocation techniques underlying the new general algorithms have been developed in the spirit of the approach described in [12] and extend the methods proposed in [17]. Alternative, non-iterative approaches to compute coprime factorizations with inner denominators have been proposed in [9, 7].

2. Descriptor system based computations. In this section we present some basic notions on descriptor systems, and describe the main reduction and updating techniques employed in the paper.

2.1. Preliminaries on descriptor systems. Let $G(\lambda)$ be a $p \times m$ real rational matrix and consider an n-th order descriptor system realization $(A - \lambda E, B, C, D)$, with $A - \lambda E$ an $n \times n$ regular pencil (i.e., $\det(A - \lambda E) \not\equiv 0$), which satisfies

$$G(\lambda) = C(\lambda E - A)^{-1}B + D. \tag{4}$$

We will also use the equivalent notation for the TFM (4)

$$G(\lambda) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A - \lambda E & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array}\right]. \tag{5}$$

If $Q, Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ are invertible matrices, then the two realizations $(A - \lambda E, B, C, D)$ and $(\widetilde{A} - \lambda\widetilde{E}, \widetilde{B}, \widetilde{C}, D)$, whose matrices are related by a similarity transformation of the form

$$\widetilde{A} - \lambda\widetilde{E} = Q(A - \lambda E)Z, \quad \widetilde{B} = QB, \quad \widetilde{C} = CZ\,, \tag{6}$$

have the same TFM $G(\lambda)$.

We recall from [20, 19] some basic notions related to descriptor system realizations. A realization $(A-\lambda E, B, C, D)$ is *minimal* if it is controllable, observable and has no non-dynamic modes. The poles of $G(\lambda)$ are related to $\Lambda(A-\lambda E)$, the eigenvalues of the pencil $A-\lambda E$ (also known as the generalized eigenvalues of the pair (A, E)). For a minimal realization, the finite poles of $G(\lambda)$ are the finite eigenvalues of $A - \lambda E$, while the multiplicities of infinite poles are

defined by the multiplicities of infinite eigenvalues of $A-\lambda E$ minus one. A finite eigenvalue λ_f is controllable if $\operatorname{rank}[\,A-\lambda_f E\;B\,]=n$, otherwise is uncontrollable. Similarly, a finite eigenvalue λ_f is observable if $\operatorname{rank}[\,A^T-\lambda_f E^T\;C^T\,]=n$, otherwise is unobservable. Infinite controllability requires that $\operatorname{rank}[\,E\;B\,]=n$, while infinite observability requires that $\operatorname{rank}[\,E^T\;C^T\,]=n$. The lack of non-dynamic modes can be equivalently expressed as $A\ker(E)\subseteq \operatorname{Im}(E)$.

Consider a given disjunct partition of the complex plane as in (1). We say the descriptor system (5) is *proper* $\mathbb{C}_g$*-stable* if all finite eigenvalues of $A-\lambda E$ belong to $\mathbb{C}_g$ and all infinite eigenvalues of $A-\lambda E$ are simple. The descriptor system (5) (or equivalently the pair $(A-\lambda E,B)$) is $\mathbb{C}_b$*-stabilizable* if $\operatorname{rank}\left[\begin{array}{cc} A-\lambda E & B\end{array}\right]=n$ for all finite $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}_b$. The descriptor system (5) (or equivalently the pair $(A-\lambda E,C)$) is $\mathbb{C}_b$*-detectable* if $\operatorname{rank}\left[\begin{array}{c} A-\lambda E\\ C\end{array}\right]=n$ for all finite $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}_b$.

2.2. Reduction of the pole pencil to a special form. Using two orthogonal transformation matrices Q and Z, it is possible to reduce a regular pencil $A-\lambda E$ to a specially ordered *generalized real Schur form* (GRSF) $\widetilde{A}-\lambda\widetilde{E}:=Q(A-\lambda E)Z$, with the eigenvalues of the component diagonal blocks split in four diagonal blocks:

$$\widetilde{A}-\lambda\widetilde{E}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc} A_\infty & * & * & * \\ 0 & A_g-\lambda E_g & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & A_{f,b}-\lambda E_{f,b} & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & A_{\infty,b}-\lambda E_{\infty,b}\end{array}\right], \tag{7}$$

where: (i) A_∞ is an $(n-r)\times(n-r)$ invertible (upper triangular) matrix, with $r=\operatorname{rank}E$; the leading pair $(A_\infty,0)$ contains all infinite eigenvalues of $A-\lambda E$ corresponding to first-order eigenvectors; (ii) A_g and E_g are $n_g\times n_g$ matrices, such that the pair (A_g,E_g) is in a GRSF (i.e., A_g upper quasi-triangular and E_g upper triangular) and $\Lambda(A_g-\lambda E_g)\subset\mathbb{C}_g$; (iii) $A_{f,b}$ and $E_{f,b}$ are $n_b^f\times n_b^f$ matrices, such that the pair $(A_{f,b},E_{f,b})$ is in a GRSF and $\Lambda(A_{f,b}-\lambda E_{f,b})$ contains the finite eigenvalues lying in $\mathbb{C}_b$; and (iv) $A_{\infty,b}$ and $E_{\infty,b}$ are $n_b^\infty\times n_b^\infty$ upper triangular matrices and $\Lambda(A_{\infty,b}-\lambda E_{\infty,b})$ contains the rest of infinite eigenvalues. The matrices E_g, $E_{f,b}$, $A_{\infty,b}$ are invertible, while $E_{\infty,b}$ is nilpotent.

The reduction of a pair (A,E) to the specially ordered GRSF (7) can be performed in three main steps. In the first step, we isolate the infinite eigenvalues having first order eigenvectors using two orthogonal transformation matrices Q_1 and Z_1 such that

$$Q_1(A-\lambda E)Z_1=\left[\begin{array}{cc} A_\infty & * \\ 0 & A_{22}-\lambda E_{22}\end{array}\right],$$

where the regularity of $A-\lambda E$ ensures that A_∞ is nonsingular and the pencil $A_{22}-\lambda E_{22}$ is regular. This step involves the compression of the columns of E using an orthogonal transformation matrix Z_1 such that $EZ_1=[\,0\;E_2\,]$, with E_2 full column rank $r=\operatorname{rank}E$, and the conformably partitioned $AZ_1=[\,A_1\;A_2\,]$, with A_1 having full column rank $n-r$. Typically, such a compression is performed using the QR decomposition with column pivoting applied to E^T [4]. Then, an orthogonal Q_1 is determined such that $Q_1A_1=\left[\begin{array}{c} A_\infty\\ 0\end{array}\right]$, with A_∞ an $(n-r)\times(n-r)$ invertible upper triangular matrix. This computation can be done using the standard QR decomposition of a full column rank matrix [4].

At the second step, the pair (A_{22},E_{22}) is reduced, using two orthogonal transformation matrices Q_2 and Z_2, to the form

$$Q_2(A_{22}-\lambda E_{22})Z_2=\left[\begin{array}{cc} A_f-\lambda E_f & * \\ 0 & A_{\infty,b}-\lambda E_{\infty,b}\end{array}\right], \tag{8}$$

where the pair $(A_{\infty,b},E_{\infty,b})$ has only infinite generalized eigenvalues, $A_{\infty,b}-\lambda E_{\infty,b}$ is upper triangular, with $E_{\infty,b}$ nilpotent, and all eigenvalues of $A_f-\lambda E_f$ are finite. The infinite-finite splitting of eigenvalues can be reliably computed by applying the orthogonal reduction algorithm of [8] to the transposed pencil $A_{22}^T-\lambda E_{22}^T$. This algorithm determines the orthogonal transformation matrices Z_2^T and Q_2^T, such that the reduced pencil $Z_2^T(A_{22}^T-\lambda E_{22}^T)Q_2^T$ is in a 2×2 block upper triangular form, where the leading block contains the infinite eigenvalues,

with the matrices in an upper triangular (staircase) form, while the trailing block contains the finite eigenvalues. The form (8) is obtained by pertransposing the resulting pair,[1] using a permutation matrix P_2 of appropriate size. This operation interchanges the order of the infinite and finite blocks and preserves the upper triangular shape of the blocks containing the infinite eigenvalues, which form the resulting pencil $A_{\infty,b}-\lambda E_{\infty,b}$.

At the third step, we reduce the pair (A_f, E_f) to an ordered GRSF, using two orthogonal transformation matrices Q_3 and Z_3, such that

$$Q_3(A_f-\lambda E_f)Z_3 = \begin{bmatrix} A_g-\lambda E_g & * \\ 0 & A_{f,b}-\lambda E_{f,b} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\Lambda(A_g-\lambda E_g) \subset \mathbb{C}_g$ and $\Lambda(A_{f,b}-\lambda E_{f,b}) \subset \mathbb{C}_b$. Suitable algorithms (e.g., the QZ algorithm) to reduce a matrix pair to the GRSF and to reorder the eigenvalues by permuting the 1×1 and 2×2 diagonal blocks are described in [4].

The following procedure summarizes the main computational steps of the reduction of a regular pair (A, E), to a pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E}) = (QAZ, QEZ)$ in the specially ordered GRSF (7), by employing the orthogonal transformation matrices Q and Z.

Procedure GSORSF.

1. Compute an orthogonal Z_1 such that $EZ_1 = [\,0\ E_2\,]$, with E_2 full column rank $r = \operatorname{rank} E$; compute the conformably partitioned $AZ_1 = [\,A_1\ A_2\,]$, with A_1 having full column rank $n-r$.
2. Compute an orthogonal Q_1 such that $Q_1A_1 = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} A_\infty \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, with A_∞ an $(n-r)\times(n-r)$ invertible upper triangular matrix; compute the conformably partitioned matrices
$$Q_1A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} * \\ A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_1E_2 = \begin{bmatrix} * \\ E_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$
3. Apply the staircase algorithm of [8] to the transposed pencil $A_{22}^T - \lambda E_{22}^T$ to obtain the orthogonal transformation matrices Z_2^T and Q_2^T such that
$$P_2Q_2(A_{22}-\lambda E_{22})Z_2P_2 = \begin{bmatrix} A_f-\lambda E_f & * \\ 0 & A_{\infty,b}-\lambda E_{\infty,b} \end{bmatrix},$$
where P_2 is a permutation matrix of appropriate size with ones down on the secondary diagonal, the pair $(A_{\infty,b}, E_{\infty,b})$ has only infinite generalized eigenvalues, $A_{\infty,b}-\lambda E_{\infty,b}$ is upper triangular, with $E_{\infty,b}$ nilpotent, and all eigenvalues of $A_f-\lambda E_f$ are finite.
4. Compute orthogonal Q_3 and Z_3 such that
$$Q_3(A_f-\lambda E_f)Z_3 = \begin{bmatrix} A_g-\lambda E_g & * \\ 0 & A_{f,b}-\lambda E_{f,b} \end{bmatrix}$$
is in a GRSF, where $\Lambda(A_g-\lambda E_g) \subset \mathbb{C}_g$ and $\Lambda(A_{f,b}-\lambda E_{f,b}) \subset \mathbb{C}_b$.
5. Set $Q = \operatorname{diag}(I_{n-r}, Q_3, I)\operatorname{diag}(I_{n-r}, P_2Q_2)Q_1$, $Z = Z_1\operatorname{diag}(I_{n-r}, Z_2P_2)\operatorname{diag}(I_{n-r}, Z_3, I)$ and define $\widetilde{A} = QAZ$ and $\widetilde{E} = QEZ$ from the reduced pencil (7).

The computations performed at Steps 1, 2 and 4 of **Procedure GSORSF** rely on standard numerically stable algorithms (described, for example, in [4]), as the rank revealing QR decomposition with column pivoting or the QZ algorithm to compute and reorder the GRSF of a matrix pair. The numerical complexity of these steps is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. The finite-infinite separation performed at Step 3, using the numerically stable staircase algorithm of [8], employs a rank revealing QR-decomposition-based staircase reduction technique. The performed orthogonal transformations consists of sequences of Householder or Givens transformations, which are not accumulated but directly applied to the involved submatrices. Using this reduction technique (i.e., without explicitly accumulating the performed orthogonal transformations employed for

[1] Pertransposing a square matrix M is the operation to form PM^TP, where P is a permutation matrix with ones down the secondary diagonal.

rank determinations), guarantees the $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ computational complexity of this step. Therefore, the overall computational complexity of the **Procedure GSORSF** is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ as well. The reliability of rank decisions can be improved, using *singular value decomposition* (SVD)-based rank decisions instead QR-decomposition-based rank decisions. Such an approach has been proposed, for example, in [11]. Due to the need to explicitly accumulate the performed orthogonal transformations, the worst-case complexity of this approach is $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$. An alternative computational technique of complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$, with the same level of reliability of rank determinations, has been suggested in [8], and consists in combining QR decomposition based reductions (without column pivoting) with SVD-based rank decisions (performed only for small matrices).

2.3. Descriptor system based updating formulas. The denominator factor $M(\lambda)$ of the RCF can be represented in a product form as

$$M(\lambda) = \widetilde{M}_1(\lambda)\widetilde{M}_2(\lambda)\cdots\widetilde{M}_k(\lambda), \tag{9}$$

where each $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ $(i = 1, \ldots, k)$ is an invertible elementary proper factor having either a real pole or a pair of complex conjugate poles. The recursive computational procedure can be formalized as k successive applications of the updating formula

$$\begin{bmatrix} N_i(\lambda) \\ M_i(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} N_{i-1}(\lambda) \\ M_{i-1}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \widetilde{M}_i(\lambda), \quad i = 1, \ldots, k\,, \tag{10}$$

initialized with $N_0(\lambda) = G(\lambda)$ and $M_0(\lambda) = I_m$. Then, $N(\lambda) = N_k(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda) = M_k(\lambda)$. By this approach, it is automatically achieved that the resulting $M(\lambda)$ has the least achievable McMillan degree n_b.

We can derive state-space formulas for the efficient implementation of the updating operations in (10). Assume $N_{i-1}(\lambda)$ and $M_{i-1}(\lambda)$ have the descriptor realizations

$$\begin{bmatrix} N_{i-1}(\lambda) \\ M_{i-1}(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} A_{11}-\lambda E_{11} & A_{12}-\lambda E_{12} & B_1 \\ 0 & A_{22}-\lambda E_{22} & B_2 \\ \hline C_{N,1} & C_{N,2} & D_N \\ C_{M,1} & C_{M,2} & D_M \end{array}\right] =: \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widetilde{A}-\lambda\widetilde{E} & \widetilde{B} \\ \hline \widetilde{C}_N & \widetilde{D}_N \\ \widetilde{C}_M & \widetilde{D}_M \end{array}\right], \tag{11}$$

where $\Lambda(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}) \subset \mathbb{C}_b$. We assume that $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ is a 1×1 pencil in the case when $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ has a real or an infinite eigenvalue, or is a 2×2 pencil, in the case when $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ has a pair of complex conjugate eigenvalues. This form automatically results if the pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ is in the specially ordered GRSF (7). We discuss several cases which can be encountered when performing the updating.

If $B_2 = 0$, then the eigenvalue(s) of $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ is (are) not controllable, and thus can be removed to obtain lower order realizations $N_i(\lambda) := N_{i-1}(\lambda)$ and $M_i(\lambda) := M_{i-1}(\lambda)$

$$\begin{bmatrix} N_i(\lambda) \\ M_i(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_{11}-\lambda E_{11} & B_1 \\ \hline C_{N,1} & D_N \\ C_{M,1} & D_M \end{array}\right] =: \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widetilde{A}-\lambda\widetilde{E} & \widetilde{B} \\ \hline \widetilde{C}_N & \widetilde{D}_N \\ \widetilde{C}_M & \widetilde{D}_M \end{array}\right]. \tag{12}$$

If $B_2 \neq 0$ and the pencil $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ has finite eigenvalues (i.e., E_{22} is invertible), then the pair $(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}, B_2)$ is (finite) controllable and there exists F_2 such that the eigenvalues of $A_{22} + B_2F_2 - \lambda E_{22}$ can be placed in arbitrary locations in $\mathbb{C}_g$. Assume that such an F_2 has been determined and define the elementary factor

$$\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda) = (A_{22} + B_2F_2 - \lambda E_{22},\, B_2W,\, F_2,\, W), \tag{13}$$

where W is chosen to ensure the invertibility of $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$. To compute stable and proper RCFs, the choice $W = I_m$ is always possible. However, alternative choices of W are necessary to

ensure, for example, that $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ is inner (see Section 3.2). It is easy to check that the updated factors $N_i(\lambda)$ and $M_i(\lambda)$ in (10) have the realizations

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} N_i(\lambda) \\ M_i(\lambda) \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} A_{11}-\lambda E_{11} & A_{12}+B_1F_2-\lambda E_{12} & B_1W \\ 0 & A_{22}+B_2F_2-\lambda E_{22} & B_2W \\ \hline C_{N,1} & C_{N,2}+D_NF_2 & D_NW \\ C_{M,1} & C_{M,2}+D_MF_2 & D_MW \end{array}\right].$$

If we denote $\widetilde{F} = [\, 0 \; F_2 \,]$, then the above relations lead to the following updating formulas [17]:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \widetilde{A} & \leftarrow & \widetilde{A}+\widetilde{B}\widetilde{F}, \\ \widetilde{B} & \leftarrow & \widetilde{B}W, \\ \widetilde{C}_N & \leftarrow & \widetilde{C}_N+\widetilde{D}_N\widetilde{F}, \\ \widetilde{C}_M & \leftarrow & \widetilde{C}_M+\widetilde{D}_M\widetilde{F}, \\ \widetilde{D}_N & \leftarrow & \widetilde{D}_NW, \\ \widetilde{D}_M & \leftarrow & \widetilde{D}_MW. \end{array} \tag{14}$$

If $B_2 \neq 0$ and the 1×1 pencil $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ has an infinite eigenvalue (i.e., $E_{22} = 0$), then we choose the elementary factor

$$\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda) = (\gamma - \lambda\eta,\, B_2,\, F_2,\, W), \tag{15}$$

where $\eta \neq 0$ and γ/η is an arbitrary real pole in $\mathbb{C}_g$, W is a projection matrix chosen such $B_2W = 0$ and $\operatorname{rank}\left[\begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ W \end{smallmatrix}\right] = m$, and F_2 has been chosen such that $B_2F_2 = -A_{22}$ and $\operatorname{rank}[\, F_2 \; W \,] = m$ (the rank conditions guarantee the invertibility of $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$). Straightforward choices of F_2 and W are, for example,

$$\begin{array}{l} F_2 = -B_2^T(B_2B_2^T)^{-1}A_{22}, \\ W = I - B_2^T(B_2B_2^T)^{-1}B_2. \end{array} \tag{16}$$

By this choice of $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$, we made the infinite eigenvalue in the realization of the updated factors $N_i(\lambda)$ and $M_i(\lambda)$ uncontrollable, and after its elimination, we obtain the realizations

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} N_i(\lambda) \\ M_i(\lambda) \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} A_{11}-\lambda E_{11} & A_{12}+B_1F_2-\lambda E_{12} & B_1W \\ 0 & \gamma-\lambda\eta & B_2 \\ \hline C_{N,1} & C_{N,2}+D_NF_2 & D_NW \\ C_{M,1} & C_{M,2}+D_MF_2 & D_MW \end{array}\right].$$

The above relations lead to the following updating formulas:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \widetilde{A} & \leftarrow & \left[\begin{smallmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12}+B_1F_2 \\ 0 & \gamma \end{smallmatrix}\right], \\ \widetilde{E} & \leftarrow & \left[\begin{smallmatrix} E_{11} & E_{12} \\ 0 & \eta \end{smallmatrix}\right], \\ \widetilde{B} & \leftarrow & \left[\begin{smallmatrix} B_1W \\ B_2 \end{smallmatrix}\right], \\ \widetilde{C}_N & \leftarrow & \left[\begin{smallmatrix} C_{N,1} & C_{N,2}+D_NF_2 \end{smallmatrix}\right], \\ \widetilde{C}_M & \leftarrow & \left[\begin{smallmatrix} C_{M,1} & C_{M,2}+D_MF_2 \end{smallmatrix}\right], \\ \widetilde{D}_N & \leftarrow & D_NW, \\ \widetilde{D}_M & \leftarrow & D_MW. \end{array} \tag{17}$$

The updating techniques relying on the formulas (14) and (17) ensure that, if the original pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ was in a GRSF, then the updated pair will have a similar form, possibly with $\widetilde{A} - \lambda\widetilde{E}$ having a 2×2 trailing block which corresponds to two real generalized eigenvalues (to recover the GRSF, such a block can be further split into two 1×1 blocks using an orthogonal similarity transformation).

3. Computation of RCFs. In this section we present the computational procedures to compute proper $\mathbb{C}_g$-stable RCFs and stable RCFs with inner denominators, and discuss the main numerical features of the proposed algorithms, as generality, numerical reliability and computational efficiency.

3.1. Computation of proper $\mathbb{C}_g$-stable RCFs. To compute a proper $\mathbb{C}_g$-stable RCF of an arbitrary rational TFM $G(\lambda)$ with a descriptor system realization $(A-\lambda E, B, C, D)$, we start by reducing the pair (A, E) to the special GRSF (7) by performing a system similarity transformation as in (6) using orthogonal transformation matrices Q and Z. Then, by employing the updating techniques described previously, we can dislocate the generalized eigenvalues of the trailing elementary 1×1 or 2×2 blocks to locations in $\mathbb{C}_g$. Finally, the reordering of the diagonal blocks in the GRSF of the updated pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$, brings in the trailing position a new block, whose generalized eigenvalues (finite or infinite) lie in $\mathbb{C}_b$. This eigenvalue dislocation process is repeated until all eigenvalues are moved into $\mathbb{C}_g$.

The following procedure computes for an arbitrary $p \times m$ rational TFM $G(\lambda)$, with a descriptor system realization $(A-\lambda E, B, C, D)$, and for a given disjunct partition of the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ as in (1), a RCF $G(\lambda) = N(\lambda)M^{-1}(\lambda)$, with the resulting factors having proper $\mathbb{C}_g$-stable descriptor realizations $N(\lambda) = (\widetilde{A}-\lambda\widetilde{E}, \widetilde{B}, \widetilde{C}_N, \widetilde{D}_N)$ and $M(\lambda) = (\widetilde{A}-\lambda\widetilde{E}, \widetilde{B}, \widetilde{C}_M, \widetilde{D}_M)$.

Procedure GRCF.

1. Compute, using **Procedure GSORSF**, the orthogonal matrices Q and Z to reduce the pair (A, E) to the specially ordered GRSF $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ in (7). Compute $\widetilde{B} := QB$, $\widetilde{C}_N := CZ$, and set $\widetilde{C}_M = 0$, $\widetilde{D}_N = D$, $\widetilde{D}_M = I_m$, $q := r + n_g$, $n_b = n_b^f + n_b^\infty$.
2. If $n_b = 0$, **Exit**.
3. Let (A_{22}, E_{22}) be the last $k\times k$ diagonal blocks of the GRSF of $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ (with $k=1$ or $k=2$) and let B_2 be the $k \times m$ matrix formed from the last k rows of $\widetilde{B}$.
   If $B_2 = 0$, then remove the uncontrollable eigenvalues $\Lambda(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22})$ and redefine $\widetilde{A}$, $\widetilde{E}$, $\widetilde{B}$, $\widetilde{C}_N$, $\widetilde{C}_M$ according to (12); update $n \leftarrow n-k$, $n_b \leftarrow n_b - k$ and go to Step 2.
4. If $E_{22} = 0$, compute $F_2 = -B_2^T(B_2B_2^T)^{-1}A_{22}$ and $W = I_m - B_2^T(B_2B_2^T)^{-1}B_2$. Choose $\eta = 1$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}_g$ and update $\widetilde{A}$, $\widetilde{E}$, $\widetilde{B}$, $\widetilde{C}_N$, $\widetilde{D}_N$, $\widetilde{C}_M$ and $\widetilde{D}_M$ using (17).
5. If $E_{22} \neq 0$, determine F_2 such that $\Lambda(A_{22} + B_2F_2 - \lambda E_{22}) \subset \mathbb{C}_g$. Set $\widetilde{F} = [\,0 \;\; F_2\,]$, $W = I_m$ and update $\widetilde{A}$, $\widetilde{E}$, $\widetilde{B}$, $\widetilde{C}_N$, $\widetilde{D}_N$, $\widetilde{C}_M$ and $\widetilde{D}_M$ using (14).
6. Compute the orthogonal matrices $\widetilde{Q}$ and $\widetilde{Z}$ to move the last blocks of $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ to positions $(q+1, q+1)$ by interchanging the diagonal blocks of the GRSF. Compute $\widetilde{A} \leftarrow \widetilde{Q}\widetilde{A}\widetilde{Z}$, $\widetilde{E} \leftarrow \widetilde{Q}\widetilde{E}\widetilde{Z}$, $\widetilde{B} \leftarrow \widetilde{Q}\widetilde{B}$, $\widetilde{C}_N \leftarrow \widetilde{C}_N\widetilde{Z}$, $\widetilde{C}_M \leftarrow \widetilde{C}_M\widetilde{Z}$. Put $q \leftarrow q+k$, $n_b \leftarrow n_b - k$ and go to Step 2.

With the special GRSF (7) computed at Step 1, the procedure executes at the beginning the Steps 3, 4 and 6 repeatedly, until all controllable infinite eigenvalues are dislocated to finite locations. In the reordering of diagonal blocks performed at Step 6 to recover the special GRSF (7), it is possible to exploit the structure of the blocks containing the infinite generalized eigenvalues of the pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$. Consequently, the swapping of two 1×1 diagonal blocks, where the first one contains an infinite and the second one contains a finite eigenvalue, can be reliably performed by explicitly restoring the zero diagonal elements in $\widetilde{E}$ (these elements are usually blurred by roundoff errors incurred by swapping). This part of the algorithm ensures that the resulting factors are proper and can be interpreted as more elaborated versions of the Algorithms PRRCF1 and PRRCF2 presented in [17].

After the dislocation of infinite eigenvalues, the procedure executes the Steps 3, 5 and 6 repeatedly, until all controllable finite eigenvalues in $\mathbb{C}_b$ are dislocated to new locations in $\mathbb{C}_g$. This computation corresponds to Algorithm GRCF-P in [17] and can be interpreted as an extension of the GRSF-based method for pole assignment [16].

The **Procedure GRCF** is completely general, being applicable regardless the original descriptor realization of $G(\lambda)$ is $\mathbb{C}_b$-stabilizable or not, is infinite controllable or not. The resulting pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ is in a particular GRSF with $n-r$ simple infinite eigenvalues in the leading $n-r$ positions (no such block exists if E is invertible). Thus, the elimination of non-dynamic (simple) modes can be done by applying standard state residualization formulas.

A minimal realization of the denominator $M(\lambda)$ can be easily determined. The resulting

$\widetilde{C}_M$ has always the form

$$\widetilde{C}_M = [\,0 \;\; \widetilde{C}_{M,2}\,], \tag{18}$$

where the number of columns of $\widetilde{C}_{M,2}$ is equal to the number of controllable generalized eigenvalues of the pair (A, E) lying in $\mathbb{C}_b$. By partitioning accordingly the resulting $\widetilde{E}$, $\widetilde{A}$ and $\widetilde{B}$

$$\widetilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \; \widetilde{E} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{11} & E_{12} \\ 0 & E_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \; \widetilde{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{19}$$

we obtain $(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}, B_2, \widetilde{C}_{M,2}, \widetilde{D}_M)$, which is a minimal descriptor system realization of $M(\lambda)$. The order of the minimal realization of $M(\lambda)$ has the least possible McMillan degree if all eigenvalues of $A - \lambda E$ in $\mathbb{C}_b$ are observable (i.e, the pair $(A - \lambda E, C)$ is $\mathbb{C}_b$-detectable).

3.2. Computation of stable RCFs with inner denominator. For the computation of stable RCFs with inner denominators, a recursive procedure, similar to that of previous section, can be developed. In this case, we use the partition of the complex plane with $\mathbb{C}_g = \mathbb{C}_s$ and $\mathbb{C}_b = \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{C}_s$, where $\mathbb{C}_s$ is the stability domain for the poles. Recall, that $\mathbb{C}_s$ is the open left half-plane for a continuous-time system, or the interior of the unit circle centered in the origin, for a discrete-time system. For a given rational matrix $G(\lambda)$, a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a stable RCF with inner denominator is that $G(\lambda)$ has no poles in $\partial\mathbb{C}_s$, the boundary of $\mathbb{C}_s$. In the continuous-time case, this means that $G(s)$ is proper and has no poles on the imaginary axis, while in the discrete-time case $G(z)$ has no poles on the unit circle centered in the origin, but for the sake of generality, $G(z)$ can be improper (i.e., having infinite poles).

For a descriptor system realization $(A - \lambda E, B, C, D)$ of $G(\lambda)$, sufficient conditions for the existence of a stable RCF with inner denominator can be formulated in terms of the eigenvalues of the pole pencil $A - \lambda E$. In the continuous-time case, we merely require that the pencil $A - sE$ has no finite controllable eigenvalues on the imaginary axis and no higher order controllable infinite eigenvalues. In the discrete-time case, the pencil $A - zE$ has no controllable eigenvalues on the unit circle centered in the origin, but may have arbitrary number of infinite eigenvalues.

In the recursive procedure to compute the RCF with inner denominator, elementary inner factors are employed to dislocate one or a pair of complex conjugate poles at each iteration. Let assume that at the i-th step, we have the matrices A_{22}, E_{22} and B_2 as defined in (11). We encounter two cases when determining the i-th elementary factor $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ in (9).

If $B_2 \neq 0$ and E_{22} invertible, then we choose $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ of the form (13), with F_2 and W determined as follows (see [17, Fact 5]): for a continuous-time system

$$F_2 = -B_2^T (Y E_{22}^T)^{-1}, \quad W = I_m, \tag{20}$$

where Y is the solution of the *generalized continuous-time Lyapunov equation* (GCLE)

$$A_{22} Y E_{22}^T + E_{22} Y A_{22}^T - B_2 B_2^T = 0, \tag{21}$$

while for a discrete-time system F_2 and W are computed from

$$\begin{aligned} &F_2 = -B_2^T (Y A_{22}^T)^{-1}, \\ &W^T (I + B_2^T (E_{22} Y E_{22}^T)^{-1} B_2) W = I, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where Y is the solution of the *generalized discrete-time Lyapunov equation* (GDLE) (also called generalized Stein equation)

$$A_{22} Y A_{22}^T - B_2 B_2^T = E_{22} Y E_{22}^T. \tag{23}$$

The above choice ensures that the poles of $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ are the reflected generalized eigenvalues of the pair (A_{22}, E_{22}) with respect to the imaginary axis, in the continuous-time case, or with

respect to the unit circle in the origin, in the discrete-time case. For this case, the updating formulas (14) are used.

The second case may appear only for an improper discrete-time system, for which $B_2 \neq 0$, $A_{22} \neq 0$, and $E_{22} = 0$. The corresponding infinite pole is reflected to the origin, by choosing $\widetilde{M}_i(z)$ of the form (15), with $\gamma = 0$, $\eta = -A_{22}$, and F_2 and W determined as in (16). For this case, the updating formulas (17) are used. The formulas (16) underlying the computation of the elementary inner factor $\widetilde{M}_i(z)$ have been derived using the dual results of [7, Theorem 3.2].

The following procedure computes for a $p \times m$ rational TFM $G(\lambda)$, with a descriptor system realization $(A - \lambda E, B, C, D)$, a RCF $G(\lambda) = N(\lambda)M^{-1}(\lambda)$, with the resulting inner factors having proper $\mathbb{C}_s$-stable descriptor realizations $N(\lambda) = (\widetilde{A} - \lambda\widetilde{E}, \widetilde{B}, \widetilde{C}_N, \widetilde{D}_N)$ and $M(\lambda) = (\widetilde{A} - \lambda\widetilde{E}, \widetilde{B}, \widetilde{C}_M, \widetilde{D}_M)$.

Procedure GRCFID.

1. Compute, using **Procedure GSORSF**, the orthogonal matrices Q and Z to reduce the pair (A, E) to the specially ordered GRSF $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ in (7).
   Compute $\widetilde{B} := QB$, $\widetilde{C}_N := CZ$, and set $\widetilde{C}_M = 0$, $\widetilde{D}_N = D$, $\widetilde{D}_M = I_m$, $q := r + n_g$, $n_b = n_b^f + n_b^\infty$.
2. If $n_b = 0$, **Exit**.
3. Let (A_{22}, E_{22}) be the last $k \times k$ diagonal blocks of the GRSF of $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ (with $k=1$ or $k=2$) and let B_2 be the $k \times m$ matrix formed from the last k rows of $\widetilde{B}$.
   If $B_2 = 0$, then remove the uncontrollable eigenvalues $\Lambda(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22})$ and redefine $\widetilde{A}$, $\widetilde{E}$, $\widetilde{B}$, $\widetilde{C}_N$, $\widetilde{C}_M$ according to (12); update $n \leftarrow n - k$, $n_b \leftarrow n_b - k$ and go to Step 2.
4. If $E_{22} = 0$, then if the descriptor system is continuous-time, **Exit** (no solution exists); else, set $\gamma = 0$, $\eta = -A_{22}$, compute F_2 and W according to (16), and update $\widetilde{A}$, $\widetilde{E}$, $\widetilde{B}$, $\widetilde{C}_N$, $\widetilde{D}_N$, $\widetilde{C}_M$ and $\widetilde{D}_M$ using (17).
5. If $E_{22} \neq 0$, then if $\Lambda(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}) \subset \partial\mathbb{C}_s$, **Exit** (no solution exists); else, determine F_2 and W as in (20) for a continuous-time system, or as in (22) for a discrete-time system, set $\widetilde{F} = [\,0\ F_2\,]$, and update $\widetilde{A}$, $\widetilde{E}$, $\widetilde{B}$, $\widetilde{C}_N$, $\widetilde{D}_N$, $\widetilde{C}_M$ and $\widetilde{D}_M$ using (14).
6. Compute the orthogonal matrices $\widetilde{Q}$ and $\widetilde{Z}$ to move the last blocks of $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ to positions $(q+1, q+1)$ by interchanging the diagonal blocks of the GRSF. Compute $\widetilde{A} \leftarrow \widetilde{Q}\widetilde{A}\widetilde{Z}$, $\widetilde{E} \leftarrow \widetilde{Q}\widetilde{E}\widetilde{Z}$, $\widetilde{B} \leftarrow \widetilde{Q}\widetilde{B}$, $\widetilde{C}_N \leftarrow \widetilde{C}_N\widetilde{Z}$, $\widetilde{C}_M \leftarrow \widetilde{C}_M\widetilde{Z}$. Put $q \leftarrow q + k$, $n_b \leftarrow n_b - k$ and go to Step 2.

The **Procedure GRCFID** is completely general and is able to compute a stable RCF with inner denominator, provided the existence conditions formulated in terms of the poles of $G(\lambda)$ are fulfilled. Note that uncontrollable eigenvalues in $\mathbb{C}_b$ or at infinity are automatically deflated. The resulting pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ is in a particular GRSF with $n-r$ simple infinite eigenvalues in the leading $n-r$ positions, which allows the immediate elimination of non-dynamic (simple) modes. A minimal realization of the denominator $M(\lambda)$ can be similarly determined as in the case of **Procedure GRCF** and has the least McMillan degree, provided the descriptor realization is $\mathbb{C}_b$-detectable.

Remark 1. In the particular case, when $G(\lambda)$ is a square all-pass and anti-stable TFM (i.e., with all poles $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{C}_s$ and all zeros in $\mathbb{C}_s$), a RCF with inner denominator $G(\lambda) = N(\lambda)M^{-1}(\lambda)$ has the factors $N(\lambda) = I$ and $M(\lambda) = G^\sim(\lambda)$. It follows, that all eigenvalues in the resulting realization of $N(\lambda)$ computed by the **Procedure GRCFID** will be unobservable. More generally, if the given TFM $G(\lambda)$ contains an unstable all-pass factor with, say k unstable poles, then the resulting descriptor system realization of $N(\lambda)$, computed by the **Procedure GRCFID**, will contain k unobservable eigenvalues, which are precisely the stable zeros of the all-pass factor. See **Example 2** presented in Section 5, with a discrete-time TFM $G(z)$ containing an unstable all-pass factor.

3.3. Numerical aspects. As already mentioned, the **Procedures GRCF** and **GRCFID** are completely general, being able to compute RCFs of rational matrices, independently

of the properties of the underlying descriptor system realization. For the computation of RCFs with minimum degree denominator factors, the $\mathbb{C}_b$-detectability condition is sufficient to guarantee the least achievable McMillan degrees of the denominators. The right coprimeness of the computed factors follows from the full (column) rank property of $\begin{bmatrix} N(\lambda) \\ M(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_g$ [21].

The **Procedure GRCF** is essentially a recursive pole assignment algorithm which exploits and maintains the GRSF of the pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$. It represents a specialization of the generalized pole assignment algorithm of [16] for descriptor systems or the pole assignment algorithm of [15] for standard systems (i.e., $E = I$). These algorithms are generally considered as satisfactory computational methods, as long as the partial feedback gains F_2 computed at Steps 4 or 5, have moderate sizes, as—for example, $\|F_2\| \leq \kappa\|A\|/\|B\|$, with say $\kappa < 100$. A careful implementation of the computation of F_2 in conjunction with optimal choices of the poles to be assigned can significantly contribute to the reduction of the size of F_2. Unfortunately, the above restriction on the partial feedback gains cannot be always fulfilled if large gains are necessary to move all poles into $\mathbb{C}_g$. This may occur either if the poles in the "bad" region $\mathbb{C}_b$ are too far from those in the "good" region $\mathbb{C}_g$ or if these poles are weekly controllable (e.g., small value of $\|B_2\|$). Nevertheless, the **Procedure GRCF** can be still considered a numerically reliable algorithm, since the above condition can be easily checked at each computational step and, therefore, the potential loss of numerical reliability can be easily detected.

The numerical properties of **Procedure GRCFID** are similar to those of **Procedure GRCF**, as long as the partial feedback gains $\|F_2\|$ at Steps 4 and 5 are reasonably small. However, this condition for numerical reliability may not always be fulfilled due to the lack of any freedom in assigning the poles. Recall that the unstable poles are reflected into symmetrical positions with respect to $\partial\mathbb{C}_s$, and this may occasionally require large gains.

The main computation burden in the proposed algorithms is the computation of the specially ordered GRSF in (7) at Step 1 and the preservation of this form using eigenvalue reordering techniques at Step 6. With the use of standard algorithms (i.e., the QR decomposition based on the Householder method, the QZ algorithm to compute and reorder the GRSF), see [4], and of the staircase algorithm of [8], the associated numerical complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

4. Implementation issues. In this section we discuss several implementation issues, which are instrumental for an efficient and robust implementation of the proposed computational procedures. The discussed issues are related to choosing the poles to be assigned at each iteration in the **Procedure GRCF**, using enhanced accuracy (square-root) techniques to compute the elementary inner factors in **Procedure GRCFID**, removing the non-dynamic modes of the resulting factors and preserving the upper quasi-triangular shape of the resulting system matrices when computing left coprime factorizations.

4.1. Pole selection and assignment. The selection of appropriate poles to be assigned at each iteration can significantly influence the overall numerical behaviour of the **Procedure GRCF**. The strategies to select poles depend on the concrete definition of the "good" region $\mathbb{C}_g$ (and also of its complement $\mathbb{C}_b = \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{C}_g$), and target either a stabilization oriented factorization or a pole allocation oriented factorization.

4.1.1. Stabilization oriented factorization. A relevant measure to characterize the desired dynamics of the factors is the stability degree, say α, of the poles of the resulting factors. For a continuous-time system, $\alpha < 0$ and α represents the maximum admissible real part of poles. Consequently, $\mathbb{C}_g$ can be defined as

$$\mathbb{C}_g = \{s \in \mathbb{C} \mid \mathrm{Re}(s) \leq \alpha < 0\}. \tag{24}$$

For a discrete-time system, $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and α represents the maximum admissible magnitude of poles. Therefore, $\mathbb{C}_g$ can be defined as

$$\mathbb{C}_g = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| \leq \alpha\}. \tag{25}$$

For a given stability degree α, the assignment of poles of the elementary factors at Steps 4 and 5 of **Procedure GRCF** can be done in such a way, that partial feedback gains F_2 with reduced size result.

In the case of an 1×1 block $A_{22}-\lambda E_{22}$ with a finite real eigenvalue, the pole to be assigned can be always chosen $\gamma=\alpha$. This choice leads at Step 5 to a least norm of F_2, which can be computed by solving

$$B_2F_2 = E_{22}\gamma - A_{22}$$

for the least-norm solution F_2. If B_2 has the RQ decomposition

$$B_2 = [\,\sigma\ 0\,]V^T = \sigma V_1^T, \tag{26}$$

where $\sigma\neq 0$ and $V=[\,V_1\ V_2\,]$ is orthogonal, with V_1 an $m\times 1$ matrix, then F_2 can be explicitly computed as

$$F_2 = V_1\frac{E_{22}\gamma - A_{22}}{\sigma}. \tag{27}$$

In the case of an 1×1 block $A_{22}-\lambda E_{22}$ with an infinite eigenvalue (i.e., $E_{22}=0$), we can use the RQ decomposition (26) to determine the feedback gain F_2 and the projection matrix W in (16) as

$$\begin{aligned} F_2 &= -V_1\frac{A_{22}}{\sigma},\\ W &= I_m - V_1V_1^T. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

In the case of a 2×2 block corresponding to a pair of complex conjugate eigenvalues $\mu\pm \mathrm{i}\tau$, to reduce the size of the partial feedback F_2 it is desirable to perform a minimum shifting of these poles to their new locations. This can be achieved by choosing the poles to be assigned $\{\gamma_1,\gamma_2\}$ as $\alpha\pm\mathrm{i}\tau$ in the continuous-time case and $\alpha(\mu\pm\mathrm{i}\tau)/\sqrt{\mu^2+\tau^2}$ in the discrete-time case. The computation of F_2 is done depending on the rank of B_2.

If $\operatorname{rank} B_2 = 2$ and Θ is 2×2 matrix such that the eigenvalues of $E_{22}^{-1}\Theta$ are the eigenvalues to be assigned, then F_2 can be computed by solving

$$B_2F_2 = E_{22}\Theta - A_{22}$$

for the least-norm solution F_2. This solution can be computed using the SVD of B_2

$$B_2 = U[\,\Sigma\ 0\,]V^T, \tag{29}$$

where Σ is a 2×2 invertible diagonal matrix, and U and V are orthogonal matrices. If we partition V as $V=[\,V_1\ V_2\,]$, with V_1 an $m\times 2$ matrix, then F_2 results as

$$F_2 = V_1\Sigma^{-1}U^T(E_{22}\Theta - A_{22}). \tag{30}$$

The choice of Θ is not unique and an optimal choice would be one for which the (Frobenius) norm of F_2 is minimum. For a pair of complex conjugate eigenvalues $\{\gamma_1,\gamma_2\}$, the matrix Θ can be parameterized in terms of two parameters θ_1 and θ_2 as

$$\Theta(\theta_1,\theta_2) = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 & \theta_2 \\ \dfrac{\theta_1(\gamma_1+\gamma_2-\theta_1)-\gamma_1\gamma_2}{\theta_2} & \gamma_1+\gamma_2-\theta_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If we denote with $F_2(\theta_1,\theta_2)$ the expression (30) evaluated for the above $\Theta(\theta_1,\theta_2)$, then the optimal values of the free parameters θ_1 and θ_2 can be determined by minimizing $\|F_2(\theta_1,\theta_2)\|_F^2$.

If $\operatorname{rank} B_2 = 1$, then Procedure A of [15] can be applied to the standard controllable pair $(E_{22}^{-1}A_{22}, E_{22}^{-1}B_2)$ to determine F_2 which assigns the selected pair of complex conjugate poles. In this case, we compute the SVD of $E_{22}^{-1}B_2$ as

$$E_{22}^{-1}B_2 = U[\,\Sigma\ 0\,]V^T,$$

where $\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, is a 2×1 matrix with $\sigma \neq 0$, and U and V are orthogonal matrices. We compute

$$U^T E_{22}^{-1} A_{22} U = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} \\ \alpha_{21} & \alpha_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{31}$$

where $\alpha_{21} \neq 0$ is guaranteed by the controllability of the pair $(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}, B_2)$. If we partition V as $V = [\, V_1 \; V_2 \,]$, with V_1 an $m \times 1$ matrix, then the partial feedback F_2 is obtained as

$$F_2 = V \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{F} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} U^T = V_1 \widetilde{F} U^T, \tag{32}$$

where $\widetilde{F} = [\, \varphi_1 \; \varphi_2 \,]$, with φ_1 and φ_2 computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1 &= (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - \alpha_{11} - \alpha_{22})/\sigma, \\ \varphi_2 &= (\alpha_{22}/\alpha_{21})\varphi_1 + (\alpha_{11}\alpha_{22} - \alpha_{12}\alpha_{21} - \gamma_1\gamma_2)/(\alpha_{21}\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

4.1.2. Pole assignment oriented factorization. Let α be a desired stability degree for the poles of the resulting factors and define the "good" region $\mathbb{C}_g$ as in (24) or (25), depending on the system type, continuous- or discrete-time, respectively. Simultaneously, let Γ be a symmetric set of complex values such that $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{C}_s$, which contains the desired poles to be assigned for the two factors. In this setting, the initial reduction of the pair (A, E) to the special GRSF (7) ensures, that all eigenvalues of $A - \lambda E$ lying in $\mathbb{C}_g$ are preserved in the descriptor system realizations of the resulting factors and only the eigenvalues lying in the "bad" region $\mathbb{C}_b$ or at infinity are assigned to the values specified in Γ. We will assume that the number of specified poles in Γ is greater than the sum of the number of controllable (higher order) infinite eigenvalues and the number of controllable finite eigenvalues in $\mathbb{C}_b$. Otherwise, Γ is extended "on the fly" with poles chosen from $\mathbb{C}_g$, in accordance with the strategy used for the stabilization oriented factorization. In determining the partial feedback F_2 at Steps 4 and 5 of **Procedure GRCF**, we encounter several cases according to the size of the last block $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ and the chosen poles to be assigned. After each successful partial pole assignment, Γ is updated by removing the already assigned poles.

If $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ is an 1×1 block with a finite eigenvalue, then a real pole $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is selected, which is the nearest one to the eigenvalue of $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$. This pole is then assigned, using (26) and (27). In the case, when there is no real pole available in Γ, but $n_b > 1$, then a 2×2 block can be formed, either by adjoining an adjacent 1×1 block or by interchanging the last two blocks of the GRSF to bring a 2×2 block in the last position. Then, a pair of complex conjugate poles from Γ can be assigned (see below). If $n_b = 1$, then $\gamma = \alpha$ is assigned.

If $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ has an infinite eigenvalue (i.e., $E_{22} = 0$), then γ is selected as the nearest real pole in Γ to the boundary $\partial\mathbb{C}_s$ and the formulas for F_2 and W in (28) are used. If no real pole is available in Γ, then $\gamma = \alpha$ is chosen. It is possible to use more complicated schemes, as for example, adjoining two adjacent blocks with infinite eigenvalues, or a finite 1×1 block and an infinite block, and assigning a pair of complex conjugate poles using suitable updating formulas (still to be developed). The chosen strategy to assign only real poles for all infinite poles appears to be the simplest one, and therefore, well suited for implementation purposes. A trivial workaround to assign a pair of complex conjugate poles to replace two infinite poles, is to assign first two real poles for the two last 1×1 blocks, and then to update the resulting 2×2 block by assigning a pair of complex conjugate poles (see below).

If $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ is a 2×2 block, then we choose the poles to be assigned $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$, as the nearest ones in Γ to the eigenvalues of $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$. If $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ has complex conjugate eigenvalues, then we assign either two real poles or, preferably, a pair of complex conjugate poles, while if $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ resulted by adjoining two 1×1 diagonal blocks, then a pair of complex conjugate poles is assigned. Depending on the rank of the corresponding B_2, we employ for the computation of F_2 either the formula (30) if $\operatorname{rank} B_2 = 2$ or the formula (32) if $\operatorname{rank} B_2 = 1$.

If $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ resulted by adjoining two 1×1 diagonal blocks and $\operatorname{rank} B_2 = 1$, it may happen that the resulting pair $(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}, B_2)$ is not controllable (because the real eigenvalue in the

leading 1×1 diagonal block of $A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}$ may be uncontrollable). The lack of controllability can be easily detected, because $\alpha_{21} = 0$ in (31). The uncontrollable eigenvalue α_{22} can be eliminated by performing an orthogonal similarity transformation on the pair $(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}, B_2)$ to obtain

$$U(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22})V := \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{11} - \lambda\eta_{11} & \alpha_{12} - \lambda\eta_{12} \\ 0 & \alpha_{22} - \lambda\eta_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad UB_2 := \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{B}_2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

with $\widetilde{B}_2 \neq 0$. Here, U is the orthogonal matrix from the SVD of B_2 in (29), while V is the orthogonal matrix from the RQ decomposition of UE_{22} (i.e., $UE_{22}V$ is upper triangular). After the separation of the uncontrollable 1×1 block $\alpha_{22} - \lambda\eta_{22}$, the updating formulas (12) are used to remove this block.

4.2. Square-root based computation of elementary inner factors. In the **Procedure GRCFID**, the computation of each elementary inner factor $\widetilde{M}_i(\lambda)$ as in (13) involves the solution of either of the GCLE (21) or of the GDLE (23), from which the partial feedback F_2 and feedthrough matrix W are determined. In each case, the solution Y is positive definite, thus it can be expressed as $Y = SS^T$, where S is an upper triangular matrix, also called (improperly) the *square-root* of Y. Methods to solve Lyapunov equations directly for the square-root factor of the solution have been proposed in [5] for $E_{22} = I$ and in [10] for a general E_{22}. These methods are provably more accurate than methods which computes Y, because they avoid explicitly forming the matrix product $B_2B_2^T$. These methods are applicable provided $\Lambda(A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}) \subset \mathbb{C}_s$ and $B_2B_2^T$ stays instead $-B_2B_2^T$ in (21) or (23). To cope with these restrictions, instead solving (21), we can solve

$$-A_{22}YE_{22}^T - E_{22}YA_{22}^T + B_2B_2^T = 0,$$

where $\Lambda(-A_{22} - \lambda E_{22}) \subset \mathbb{C}_s$, and instead solving (23), we can solve

$$E_{22}YE_{22}^T - A_{22}YA_{22}^T + B_2B_2^T = 0,$$

where $\Lambda(E_{22} - \lambda A_{22}) \subset \mathbb{C}_s$. Thus, both above Lyapunov equations can be solved directly for the square-root factor S.

The upper triangular shape of S and the diagonal form of E_{22} can be exploited in evaluating the partial feedback F_2 in (20) as

$$F_2 = -B_2^T(YE_{22}^T)^{-1} = -(S^{-T}S^{-1}(E_{22}^{-1}B_2))^T.$$

Moreover, for an 1×1 block, we can use that $A_{22} + B_2F_2 = -A_{22}$. Similarly, F_2 in (22) can be computed as

$$F_2 = -B_2^T(YA_{22}^T)^{-1} = -(S^{-T}S^{-1}(A_{22}^{-1}B_2))^T$$

and for an 1×1 block, we can use that $A_{22} + B_2F_2 = E_{22}^2/A_{22}$. The feedthrough term W in (22) can be computed as $W = R^{-1}$, with R an upper triangular (Cholesky) factor satisfying

$$R^TR = I_m + B_2^T(E_{22}YE_{22}^T)^{-1}B_2 = I_m + X^TX = [\, I_m \; X^T \,] \begin{bmatrix} I_m \\ X \end{bmatrix},$$

where $X = S^{-1}E_{22}^{-1}B_2$ is a $k \times m$ matrix, with $k = 1$ or $k = 2$. To compute R, the initial Cholesky factor I_m can be updated, by performing, k times rank-1 changes, thus avoiding to form explicitly the product X^TX (see [4][Section 6.5.1] for suitable QR factorization based updating techniques).

4.3. Removing non-dynamic modes. At the end of both **Procedure GRCF** and **Procedure GRCFID**, the matrices of the resulting realizations of the factors can be partitioned in the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} N(\lambda) \\ M(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widetilde{A} - \lambda\widetilde{E} & \widetilde{B} \\ \hline \widetilde{C}_N & \widetilde{D}_N \\ \widetilde{C}_M & \widetilde{D}_M \end{array}\right] := \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} A_\infty & \widetilde{A}_{12} - \lambda\widetilde{E}_{12} & \widetilde{B}_1 \\ 0 & \widetilde{A}_{22} - \lambda\widetilde{E}_{22} & \widetilde{B}_2 \\ \hline \widetilde{C}_{N,1} & \widetilde{C}_{N,2} & \widetilde{D}_N \\ 0 & \widetilde{C}_{M,2} & \widetilde{D}_M \end{array}\right], \tag{33}$$

where A_∞ is a $(n-r)\times(n-r)$ upper triangular matrix, with $r = \operatorname{rank} E$, and the pair $(A_\infty, 0)$ contains the $n-r$ simple infinite eigenvalues (i.e., the non-dynamic modes), while the pair $(\widetilde{A}_{22}, \widetilde{E}_{22})$ is in a GRSF with all eigenvalues in $\mathbb{C}_g$. Using state residualization formulas, the $n-r$ simple infinite eigenvalues can be eliminated to obtain a reduced order descriptor system realization of the form

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} N(\lambda) \\ M(\lambda) \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \widetilde{A}_{22} - \lambda\widetilde{E}_{22} & \widetilde{B}_2 \\ \hline \widehat{C}_N & \widehat{D}_N \\ \widehat{C}_M & \widetilde{D}_M \end{array}\right],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{C}_N &= \widetilde{C}_{N,2} - \widetilde{C}_{N,1}A_\infty^{-1}\big(\widetilde{A}_{12} - \widetilde{E}_{12}\widetilde{E}_{22}^{-1}\widetilde{A}_{22}\big), \\ \widehat{D}_N &= \widetilde{D}_N - \widetilde{C}_{N,1}A_\infty^{-1}\big(\widetilde{B}_1 - \widetilde{E}_{12}\widetilde{E}_{22}^{-1}\widetilde{B}_2\big), \\ \widehat{C}_M &= \widetilde{C}_{M,2}. \end{aligned}$$

4.4. Computation of left coprime factorizations. If we apply **Procedure GRCF** or **Procedure GRCFID** to the dual realization $(A^T - \lambda E^T, C^T, B^T, D^T)$ of $G^T(\lambda)$, we obtain the RCF $G^T(\lambda) = N(\lambda)M^{-1}(\lambda)$, from which a left coprime factorization of $G(\lambda)$ results as $G(\lambda) = \big(M^T(\lambda)\big)^{-1}N^T(\lambda)$. The realizations of $N(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda)$ have the form (33) with the pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$ in an upper GRSF. This form is advantageous in many applications. For example, the eigenvalues of $\widetilde{A} - \lambda\widetilde{E}$ can be determined practically at no computational cost, and can be further reordered by preserving the upper quasi-triangular shape (GRSF) of the pair $(\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{E})$. The dual realizations of $N^T(\lambda)$ and $M^T(\lambda)$ have the pair $\big(\widetilde{A}^T, \widetilde{E}^T\big)$ in a lower GRSF, which has some inconveniences for numerical computations. For example, the computation of eigenvalues using standard tools (e.g., MATLAB[2]) involves performing the whole QZ algorithm [4] to obtain an upper GRSF. A simple trick can be used to obtain the dual realizations with an upper GRSF. This comes down to form the realizations of $N^T(\lambda)$ and $M^T(\lambda)$ as

$$[\,N^T(\lambda)\;M^T(\lambda)\,] = \left[\begin{array}{c|cc} P\widetilde{A}^TP - \lambda P\widetilde{E}^TP & P\widetilde{C}_N^T & P\widetilde{C}_M^T \\ \hline \widetilde{B}^TP & \widetilde{D}_N^T & \widetilde{D}_M^T \end{array}\right],$$

where P is the permutation matrix of appropriate size with ones down on the secondary diagonal. Note that, in the above realization, the simple infinite eigenvalues are now located in the trailing position of the pair $\big(P\widetilde{A}^TP, P\widetilde{E}^TP\big)$.

5. Numerical examples. Both proposed factorization procedures to compute RCFs have been implemented as MATLAB functions and belong to the free software collection of *Descriptor Systems Tools* (DSTOOLS) [14]. To illustrates the capabilities of the proposed computational algorithms, we present two simple examples computed with the functions `grcf` and `grcfid` available in DSTOOLS, which implements the **Procedure GRCF** and **Procedure GRCFID**, respectively. Both functions call the function `gsorsf` to compute the specially ordered GRSF. This function implements the **Procedure GSORSF**, but employs at Step 3, instead the method of [8], the Algorithm 3.2.1 of [1], for which an implementation is available in the SLICOT library [3].

Example 1. Consider the continuous-time improper TFM

$$G(s) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} s^2 & \dfrac{s}{s+1} \\ 0 & \dfrac{1}{s} \end{array}\right],$$

[2]MATLAB® is a registered trademark of The Mathworks, Inc.

with the corresponding minimal realization given by

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} A-sE & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array}\right] := \left[\begin{array}{ccccc|cc} 1 & -s & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -s & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1-s & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -s & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right].$$

$G(s)$ has the following set of poles: $\{-1, 0, \infty, \infty\}$. To compute a stable and proper RCF of $G(s)$, we employed the pole assignment oriented factorization, with a stability degree of $\alpha = -1$ and the desired set of poles $\Gamma = \{-1, -2, -3\}$. With the option to eliminate the non-dynamic modes, the function `grcf` computes the following descriptor system realization of the factors (converted automatically to symbolic expressions)

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} N(s) \\ M(s) \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|cc} -1-s & 0 & 0 & -3 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1-s & 1-s & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2-s & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -3-s & 0 & -1 \\ \hline 1 & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & \frac{5\sqrt{2}}{2} & 3 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 \end{array}\right],$$

which correspond to the rational matrices

$$N(s) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} -\dfrac{s^2}{(s+1)(s+2)} & \dfrac{s^2}{(s+1)(s+3)} \\ 0 & \dfrac{1}{s+3} \end{array}\right], \quad M(s) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} -\dfrac{1}{(s+1)(s+2)} & 0 \\ 0 & \dfrac{s}{s+3} \end{array}\right].$$

The McMillan degree of $M(s)$ is three, thus the least possible one.

Example 2. Consider the discrete-time improper TFM

$$G(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} z^2 & \dfrac{z}{z-2} \\ 0 & \dfrac{1}{z} \end{array}\right],$$

with the corresponding minimal realization given by

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} A-zE & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array}\right] := \left[\begin{array}{ccccc|cc} 1 & -z & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -z & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2-z & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -z & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right].$$

$G(z)$ has the following set of poles: $\{2, 0, \infty, \infty\}$ and therefore, a RCF with inner denominator exists. With the option to eliminate the non-dynamic modes, the function `grcfid` computes the following descriptor system realization of the factors (converted automatically to symbolic

expressions)

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} N(z) \\ M(z) \end{array}\right] = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|cc} -z & 0 & 0 & \frac{3}{4} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & -\sqrt{2}\,z & \sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\sqrt{2}\,z}{2} & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}-z & 0 & -1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{4} & 1 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{3}{4} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{array}\right],$$

which correspond to the rational matrices

$$N(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & \frac{1}{2z-1} \\ 0 & \frac{z-2}{z(2z-1)} \end{array}\right], \quad M(z) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} \frac{1}{z^2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{z-2}{2z-1} \end{array}\right].$$

The McMillan degree of $M(z)$ is three, thus the least possible one. Interestingly, the McMillan degree of $N(z)$ is only two, because two unobservable eigenvalues in 0 have been removed. These eigenvalues are the zeros of the (improper) all-pass factor $\mathrm{diag}(z^2, 1)$ with two infinite poles, which is contained in $G(z)$.

6. Conclusions. In this paper we proposed two numerically reliable algorithms to compute right coprime factorizations of rational matrices using descriptor system based realizations. For the computation of a $\mathbb{C}_g$-stable RCF, no particular properties of the underlying realizations need to be assumed. In particular, no $\mathbb{C}_b$-stabilizability is required, because uncontrollable eigenvalues in $\mathbb{C}_b$ are automatically removed. To determine factorizations with minimum degree denominator factors, the weakest requirement is that all controllable eigenvalues lying in $\mathbb{C}_b$ are also observable. This requirement is fulfilled, for example, if the underlying descriptor system realization is minimal, or only observable, or $\mathbb{C}_b$-detectable.

For the computation of a stable RCF with inner denominator, the condition for the lack of poles in $\partial\mathbb{C}_s$ (the boundary of the stability domain) imposes the same condition on the eigenvalues of the pole pencil, provided the descriptor realization is minimal. However, the minimality condition on the descriptor system realization can be relaxed, by only requiring the lack of controllable eigenvalues in $\partial\mathbb{C}_s$ (because the uncontrollable eigenvalues in $\partial\mathbb{C}_s$ or $\mathbb{C}_b$ are automatically removed). The minimum degree requirement for $M(\lambda)$ imposes additionally the lack of unobservable eigenvalues in $\mathbb{C}_s$.

In the light of the above considerations, both the **Procedure GRCF**, in conjunction with the pole selection and pole dislocation schemes presented in Section 4.1, as well as the **Procedure GRCFID**, in conjunction with the square-root-based computation of elementary inner factors described in Section 4.2, can be considered completely satisfactory numerical algorithms, which fulfil the standard requirements formulated in [6] for generality, numerical reliability and computational efficiency.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Beelen and P. Van Dooren, *An improved algorithm for the computation of Kronecker's canonical form of a singular pencil*, Linear Algebra Appl., 105 (1988), pp. 9–65.

[2] V. Belevitch, *Classical Network Theory*, Holden Day, San Francisco, 1968.

[3] P. Benner, V. Mehrmann, V. Sima, S. Van Huffel, and A. Varga, *SLICOT – a subroutine library in systems and control theory*, in Applied and Computational Control, Signals and Circuits, B. N. Datta, ed., vol. 1, Birkhäuser, 1999, pp. 499–539.

[4] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations, 4th Edition*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2013.

[5] S. J. Hammarling, *Numerical solution of the stable, non-negative definite Lyapunov equation*, IMA J. Numer. Anal., 2 (1982), pp. 303–323.
[6] C. B. Moler and C. F. Van Loan, *Nineteen dubious ways to compute the exponential of a matrix*, SIAM Rev., 20 (1978), pp. 801–836.
[7] C. Oară, *Constructive solutions to spectral and inner-outer factorizations with respect to the disk*, Automatica, 41 (2005), pp. 1855–1866.
[8] C. Oară and P. V. Dooren, *An improved algorithm for the computation of structural invariants of a system pencil and related geometric aspects*, Syst. Control Lett., 30 (1997), pp. 39–48.
[9] C. Oară and A. Varga, *Minimal degree coprime factorization of rational matrices*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 21 (1999), pp. 245–278.
[10] T. Penzl, *Numerical solution of generalized Lyapunov equations*, Adv. Comput. Math., 8 (1998), pp. 33–48.
[11] P. Van Dooren, *The computation of Kronecker's canonical form of a singular pencil*, Linear Algebra Appl., 27 (1979), pp. 103–141.
[12] P. Van Dooren, *Rational and polynomial matrix factorizations via recursive pole-zero cancellation*, Linear Algebra Appl., 137/138 (1990), pp. 663–697.
[13] J. Vandewalle and P. Dewilde, *On the irreducible cascade synthesis of a system with real rational transfer matrix*, IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst., 24 (1977), pp. 481–494.
[14] A. Varga, *DSTOOLS – The Descriptor System Tools for MATLAB*, https://sites.google.com/site/andreasvargacontact/home/software/dstools.
[15] A. Varga, *A Schur method for pole assignment*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control, 26 (1981), pp. 517–519.
[16] A. Varga, *On stabilization of descriptor systems*, Syst. Control Lett., 24 (1995), pp. 133–138.
[17] A. Varga, *Computation of coprime factorizations of rational matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl., 271 (1998), pp. 83–115.
[18] A. Varga, *Solving Fault Diagnosis Problems – Linear Synthesis Techniques*, vol. 84 of Studies in Systems, Decision and Control, Springer International Publishing, 2017.
[19] G. Verghese, B. Lévy, and T. Kailath, *A generalized state-space for singular systems*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control, 26 (1981), pp. 811–831.
[20] G. Verghese, P. Van Dooren, and T. Kailath, *Properties of the system matrix of a generalized state-space system*, Int. J. Control, 30 (1979), pp. 235–243.
[21] M. Vidyasagar, *Control System Synthesis: A Factorization Approach*, "Morgan & Claypool", 2011.
[22] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, and K. Glover, *Robust and Optimal Control*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, 1996.